

.A2 Not Increase

1. We meet:
 1. We meet because there ocean exploration exists and we are increasing it
 2. We meet bc Development of wind is taking place. We are increasing development
2. Topicality is not a voting issue
 1. Literature checks abuse.
 1. As the AFF, we were able to find online material as well as other literature for words in the topic and our plan. Our plan would occur in this search, which means that there is plenty of literature on our case.
 2. Clash checks abuse
 1. NEg has plenty of arguments against us, which means that no specific in round abuse has occurred since the Neg was able to come up with other attacks on our case
 3. Don't vote for potential abuse.
 1. Potential abuse is arbitrary and increases judge intervention. Potential for abuse is also inevitable. There is an infinite number of ways to "potentially abuse" our opponents. Therefore, in round abuse is the only non-arbitrary way to vote for Topicality.
 4. Reasonability is the best standard for Topicality
 1. if the Aff is reasonably topical, you should vote AFF on T.
 5. Competing Interpretations are bad framework for evaluating Topicality
 1. Negatives pick arbitrary interpretations so they can exclude the AFF, leading to an increase in judge intervention and destroying education and fairness.
 2. Our definition is better for edu bc its best context for debate, teaches grammar - obviously our opponents never listened to school house rocks' Lolly lolly adverb song 😊